

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
MARCH 13, 2007**

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Bob Breslau, Vice-Chair Jeff Evans, Julie Aitken (arrived 4:03 p.m.), Sam Engel, Jr., (arrived 4:03 p.m. and departed at 6:07 p.m.), and Casey Lee (departed 5:42 p.m.). Also present were Planning and Zoning Manager Bruce Dell, Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager Marcie Nolan, Planners David Abramson, Ingrid Allen, and Lise Bazinet, Planner Aide Carlo Galluccio, and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 9, 2007
January 23, 2007

Vice-Chair Evans asked if there was a motion to approve the minutes of January 9, 2007, and January 23, 2007.

Vice-Chair Evans so moved, seconded by Ms. Lee. In a voice vote, with Ms. Aitken and Mr. Engel being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

3. SITE PLANS

4.1 SP 12-5-05, Griffin Landmark Building, generally located just east of the Florida Turnpike, on the north side of Griffin Road (Griffin Corridor District – Griffin Commerce, Zone 4)

Mr. Abramson suggested that the Committee review item 4.1 first since it would take a short amount of time.

Chair Breslau thought it was an excellent idea and explained that the applicant had received approvals from this Committee as well as Town Council and was here to point out that they had completed the changes which had been recommended. There were no objections.

Jeff Spear, representing the petitioner, was present. He provided an updated rendering which showed the differences incorporated into the plans. Mr. Abramson concurred that all the recommendations had been made and Chair Breslau complimented the applicant. A motion was not necessary.

3.1 MSP 11-2-05, Stonebridge (aka) Oak Park Estates, southwest corner of Flamingo Road and SW 26 Street (AG, Agriculture District) **(tabled from February 13, 2007)**

Michael Woodman and Rhon Jones, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson went over the issues that were and were not accomplished by the applicant.

Mr. Woodman showed that the ten-foot buffer was taken from the northeast corner of lot two which satisfied item one of the Committee's previous recommendations. A second recommendation of the Committee was addressed and Mr. Jones agreed that the site would accommodate a sidewalk extending from the recreational trail on the west side of the entrance and continue to the loop and tie into the existing sidewalk.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the existing trees and their preservation through construction. The applicant showed the house footprint on the plans in order to demonstrate how they intended to build around some of the existing trees and enhance the ambiance of the project. Trees of lesser value were evaluated and if they were to be removed, they would be mitigated based on their measurements.

Chair Breslau noted that all the driveways accessed onto the loop and not on the entranceway. He appreciated the safety in that arrangement and asked that it be kept that way. Messrs. Jones and Woodman agreed it would remain with no driveway access on the entrance.

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
MARCH 13, 2007

Mr. Engel stated that there was a ten-foot landscaped berm area within the 20-foot drainage easement on the northern boundary and he did not think that Central Broward Water Control District (Central Broward) would allow it. Mr. Woodman responded that if it were a problem, there was enough space to make adjustments.

Ms. Lee asked that if the variances with Central Broward were not granted, what would happen to all the landscaping in the berm which was part of the applicant's mitigation. Mr. Jones responded that if the variances were not approved, they would have to submit an amended landscape plan for approval.

Ms. Lee asked that the plans be revised with a better tree protection barricade to include two-by-fours around the entire drip line. Mr. Jones stated that he would be okay with having that in the motion. She asked staff why the petitioner was not obligated to provide a landscape easement throughout the parcel's perimeter. Mr. Abramson explained that it was not required when adjacent to similar uses.

Ms. Lee asked for clarification as to the maintenance of the equestrian path since it was changed from mulch to Bahia sod. Staff and Mr. Jones indicated that since the property was owned by the Town, it would be maintained the same way the Town maintained all equestrian trails.

Ms. Lee advised that at the invitation of the petitioner, she and the Town's Urban Forester Tim Lee had walked and evaluated the tree situation on the site. She could not understand how invasive trees such as Florida Holly and Carrot Woods which had been severely damaged, were allowed to remain on the southern property line when the Town's and County's Codes required that they be removed for development. Mr. Jones advised that the entire southern property line had been cleared of brush and debris; however, the trees formed a dense buffer and residents of Stonebrook had spoken to him and had requested that the foliage be left as a buffer. Mr. Jones believed that the trees were planted south of his property line according to his surveyor and that the fence was the property line. Ms. Lee asked if Mr. Lee was comfortable with that fact and he responded affirmatively.

Ms. Lee questioned the installation of a fence at the northern property line. Ms. Aitken asserted that she believed it should be installed prior to the development of the lots in order to avoid encroachment onto the recreational trails and vice-versa. Chair Breslau agreed that a black vinyl coated, chain-link fence was customary for developers to install and he mentioned other sites where it had been done. Ms. Aitken elaborated and spoke of a developer who also had installed gates at each prospective lot so that the future homeowners would have direct access to the trails. Mr. Jones asked how tall this fence should be and since he received two replies, the height was not established. Later in the meeting, however, Chair Breslau stated that the motion should specify that the fence height would be as that which was required by Code.

As Ms. Lee was adamant regarding tree mitigation being done prior to development, she asked that the revised landscape plan L-1, be completed prior to the first certificate of occupancy being granted. Mr. Jones confirmed that the landscaping was part of the infrastructure and would be completed prior to that event.

Ms. Aitken disclosed that she heard a rumor that once the petitioner had received these approvals, the property was to be sold to a different developer; therefore, these recommendations should be crystal clear. Chair Breslau agreed that they were clear enough to apply to anyone who owned the property. Mr. Jones stated that from the very beginning, he clearly indicated that they partnered with a builder as his organization did no construction, only land development.

Ms. Lee asked that all the trees on the site be protected and Mr. Jones agreed that they would be protected.

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
MARCH 13, 2007

Neal Kalis, representing the neighboring residents of Stonebrook, spoke about the representations that had been made by Mr. Jones regarding the cleanup of the southern boundary line. After a lengthy discussion and much deliberation, Chair Breslau had both parties resolve to the following: that each would clean their side of the fence and the petitioner would repair the fence and remove all the “invasives and exotics” on his side of the fence.

Vice-Chair Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the seven items left over from the last meeting and the following: 1) that the applicant provide tree wells or retaining walls as required for the trees which were to remain and which the applicant would build around; 2) that the entrance road would not have any driveways connected onto it [just for that length of road that comes from Flamingo Road down to the loop]; 3) check with Central Broward Water Control District on the berm and drainage easement; 4) add the sidewalk on the west side of the entrance road that enters the loop; 5) add 2x4 wood barricades for tree protection on all trees slated to remain on the tree landscape plan; 6) have a minimum Code height, black vinyl, chain-link fence to separate the recreation trail from the site, to be constructed before land development and to have gates from each lot into that pedestrian trail; 7) that the sheet L-1, dated 3/6/07 mitigation, would be done before the first certificate of occupancy was issued at this project; 8) that the southern property line and a portion of the western property line be cleaned up and the fence repaired [clean up is defined as removing the “invasive and exotics” on the applicant’s property and those that have fallen onto the applicant’s property]; 9) that on each of the seven southern lots and when the landscaping was installed for the house that was being built, that four Oak trees 14-feet tall, be planted on each of those lots in addition to the Code requirement; and 10) that if the Central Broward Water Control District did not grant the variances that were needed, return to show the revisions to the Committee. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Engel – yes; Ms. Lee – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

5.1 SE 10-1-05, Davie Travel Center Inc./Brauser, 4751 SW 30 Street (TS) (Landscape only)

Chair Breslau announced that this item would be addressed next as one of the Committee members had to leave early and she was the authority on landscape issues. There were no objections.

Jill Cohen, Steve Fielden and James Aucamp, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson explained that this item had been approved by the Planning & Zoning Board and by Council with the stipulation that the landscaping plan go before the Site Plan Committee.

Ms. Nolan provided historical information regarding this site as well as the intentions for future development of the site in the Transit Oriented Corridor. She explained that eventually, this would be the type of development that the Town would like to see along the Corridor. Ms. Nolan explained that the developer would be allowed to keep the Australian Pines as a buffer along Spur Road; however, when the property would be redeveloped, they would have to be removed as they were considered an invasive species. She also explained that by Code, the applicant would be required to provide a buffer in the southeast corner separating it from “heavy duty industrial;” however, the petitioner proposed to take that required amount of trees and install them into the perimeter buffer on the north and northwest side of the property. The trees were to be good, substantial trees that would be there for a long period of time.

Ms. Cohen provided a brief presentation and advised that originally they were to provide a total of 88 trees and that this proposal consisted of 192 trees. She explained that there would be a Ficus hedge separating the southeast corner of the property from the heavy duty industrial use.

Chair Breslau contended that one of the problems with landscape plans was that the tree canopies shown on the plans were trees at maturity; however, in actuality they were planted with a canopy size that was one-quarter of what was shown on the plans. He knew that eventually they would fill out, but, for the next ten years, there would be large gaps between the trees. Ms. Cohen explained that was why the Code required accent trees between the Oaks.

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
MARCH 13, 2007

Ms. Lee disclosed that she had spoken with Mr. Aucamp. She asked if the Town was looking for instant impact because in that case, she would recommend more Oak trees spaced closer together. Ms. Nolan advised that the Town was looking for instant impact.

Mr. Fielden explained that he would not be able to develop the site for approximately three years since there would be no water and sewer provided; therefore, he had applied for the special permit in order to draw an income from the property in the meantime. Ms. Lee asked how he intended to irrigate the landscape and he replied that they would "pull the water from the lake." After considerable discussion and in the interest of the long-term benefits, it was decided that the Oaks would be spaced closer together around the perimeter in lieu of planting Crepe Myrtles, that they would be staggered in heights between 14 to 18-feet tall, and that the Ficus hedge would be increased from two-feet to four-foot tall, approximately three-and-a-half foot on center.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve and to change the landscaping on the perimeter by placing Oak trees of varying heights, 14 to 18-feet tall, 25-foot on center; that the Ficus hedge be changed from two-feet to four-feet at three-and-a-half foot on center; and that an irrigation plan would be added. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Engel – yes; Ms. Lee – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

Modifications

3.2 SPM 6-6-06, Flanigan's #55, 2190 South University Drive (B-3)

Jim Flanigan and Andre Capi, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Chair Breslau asked for samples of the new materials and colors which were part of the modification. As none were provided, he suggested that the Committee make recommendations to provide direction for the petitioner.

Mr. Engel asked what the materials were on the sides of the building as it was not provided in the plans. Mr. Capi advised that there were three materials on the side of the building, stucco, pure wood and corrugated metal.

Chair Breslau was concerned about the selection of materials and that the building was expressly dissimilar to the surrounding buildings in the area. He advised that the Town encouraged natural materials and provided examples of projects where they had been incorporated. Chair Breslau asked for assurances that the landscaping be put back to its original condition and met all landscape Codes. He also asked that the proposed children's play area be well protected with concrete bollards.

Vice-Chair Evans was very disappointed in the architecture, particularly since the row of restaurants located at this shopping center was a focus on the Town. Mr. Capi responded that the building was a corporate image and that the newer buildings were similar. They were trying to establish a nautical identity which had been very well received by the public.

Chair Breslau contended that the same argument was made by Steak and Shake, Ruby Tuesday and Fridays. He added that they did request one item which was critical to their identification such as awnings; however, they matched the rest of the buildings within the center. Mr. Capi stated that the awnings were critical to their identification and he would try to do whatever it took to make the Committee happy. Chair Breslau expressed that the Town was trying to be consistent and the quality had been upgraded in the past 20 years.

Mr. Abramson advised that the shopping center had submitted an application to repaint in earth-tone colors and perhaps the petitioner would want to coordinate their color selection.

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
MARCH 13, 2007

Vice-Chair Evans suggested an architectural detail regarding vertical elements for the building and Chair Breslau spoke of creating some impact with paint colors. Mr. Capi appreciated the input and indicated that the direction the Committee provided would be considered in his plans.

Ms. Aitken made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to table to April 10th with the following items as direction: 1) use stone, brick, or other natural materials on the building; 2) restore the landscaping to the original condition and to meet the current Code; 3) add four to six concrete bollards to protect the patio area; and, 4) fix the architecture to create some vertical elements to break up the façade. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Engel – yes; Ms. Lee – absent. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

3.3 SPM 12-1-06, Tree Tops Park, 3900 SW 100 Avenue (RS)

Abbas Zackria, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Galluccio briefed the Committee on the modifications. There were no questions for staff or the petitioner.

Ms. Aitken made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Evans, to approve subject to the planning report. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Engel – absent; Ms. Lee – absent. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

3.4 SPM 12-2-06, Pinnacle One Price Cleaners, 1275 South Nob Hill Road (B-3)

Mr. Galluccio advised that the petitioner had been unavailable and, therefore, requested that the item be tabled to the next meeting. Mr. Abramson explained that the petitioner was going through the site plan process in compliance with a Code Compliance violation.

Vice-Chair Evans indicated that he did not care for the color of the building.

Ms. Aitken made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Evans, to table to April 10, 2007. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Engel – absent; Ms. Lee – absent. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

3.5 SPM 12-3-06, Forest Lawn Memorial Gardens South, Garden Mausoleum #3, 2401 SW 64 Avenue (M-4)

Mark Farrar, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Galluccio explained the modification.

Vice-Chair Evans asked about the renovation he noticed to the roof of the main building. Mr. Farrar explained that the intent was to replace the roofing materials with something similar to glass in order to bring light into the building.

Vice-Chair Evans made a motion, seconded by Ms. Aitken, to approve based on the planning report. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Engel – absent; Ms. Lee – absent. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

3.6 SPM 1-1-07, Daystar, A Religious Non-Medical Health Care Facility, 3800 South Flamingo Road (CF)

Don Zimmer, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Mr. Zimmer provided a PowerPoint presentation to explain the need for the window replacements and the addition of the porte cochere.

Ms. Aitken made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Evans, to approve subject to the staff report. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Engel – absent; Ms. Lee – absent. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE

MARCH 13, 2007

3.7 SPM 2-1-07, Everglades Land Sales, 5000 SW 64 Avenue (B-2)

John Mayo, representing the petitioner, was present. Ms. Bazinet summarized the planning report.

Mr. Mayo provided samples of the roofing material which was consistent with the adjoining building and which was the intended choice of roofing material when the building had been built.

Vice-Chair Evans made a motion, seconded by Ms. Aitken, to approve. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Engel – absent; Ms. Lee – absent. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

4. OLD BUSINESS

4.1 SP 12-5-05, Griffin Landmark Building, generally located just east of the Florida Turnpike, on the north side of Griffin Road (Griffin Corridor District – Griffin Commerce, Zone 4)

This item was discussed earlier in the meeting.

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 SE 10-1-05, Davie Travel Center Inc./Brauser, 4751 SW 30 Street (TS) (Landscape only)

This item was approved earlier in the meeting.

6. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Mr. Abramson advised that the Planning and Zoning Division was suggesting that the Site Plan Committee meet once a month. He added that the first meeting of the month would continue, and the second meeting would occur only if necessary. It was the consensus of the Committee to give it a try.

Chair Breslau asked that minor items be moved to the beginning of the agenda if possible. Staff took note of the suggestion. He also asked if it was possible for staff to convey an opinion in order to guide the Committee on an item. Committee members agreed that it would be helpful to everyone including the petitioner to have staff's opinion in the staff report. Mr. Abramson indicated that he understood the Committee's request.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business and no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 6:33 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member